## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 15 - 234 CRB
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACTLED
STAMEY AZRILLIAN	MAR U4 2016
Defendant.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
ends of justice served by the continua	n the record on March 4 2016, the Court excludes time 2016 and finds that the nce outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a (7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (i).
defendants, the nature o or law, that it is unreasonable t	omplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of f the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact o expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ablished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
<del>-</del>	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
——————————————————————————————————————	would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time tion, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: <u>3/4/1</u> し	JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	Assistant United States Attorney